



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/721,894	11/25/2000	Kia Silverbrook	NPA061US	4082
24011	7590	01/12/2005	EXAMINER	
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD 393 DARLING STREET BALMAIN, 2041 AUSTRALIA			HUYNH, THU V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/721,894	SILVERBROOK ET AL.
	Examiner Thu V Huynh	Art Unit 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4-17 and 19-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 4-17, 19-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 07/26/2004 to application filed on 11/25/2000 which has foreign priority filed on 02/24/2000.
2. Claims 2-3, 18 are canceled.
3. Claims 1, 4-8, 11, 13-15, 17, 19-22, 24-27, 31-32 are amended.
4. Claims 1, 4-17, 19-32 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 17 are independent claims.
5. The objection of specification has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
6. The rejections of claims 1, 5-14, 17, 24-26, 28-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Levin et al., US 5,625,833 patented 1997, have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
7. The rejections of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levin as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of Wolff et al., US 6,081,261, filed 1995, have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
8. The rejections of claims 15 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levin as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, and further in view of Tonkin et al., US 6,616,702 B1, priority filed 1998, have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
9. The rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levin as applied to claims 1 above, and further in view of Wolff et al., US 6,081,261, filed 1995, and Moran et al., US 5,717,879, patented 1998, has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
10. The rejections of claims 18-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Levin as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Copperman et al., US 6,665,490 B2, filed 1999, have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

11. The rejections of claims 21 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levin further in view of Copperman as applied to claim 18 as explained above, and further in view of Wolff et al., US 6,081,261, filed 1995, have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
12. The rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levin further in view of Copperman and Wolff as applied to claim 21 as explained above, and further in view of Moran et al., US 5,717,879, patented 1998, has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
13. The rejection of claims 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levin as applied to claim 21 as explained above, and in view of Moran et al., US 5,717,879, patented 1998, has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

15. **Claims 1, 4-11, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24-26, 28-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being**

anticipated by Bergelson et al., US 6,697,056 B1, filed 01/2000.

Regarding independent claim 1, Bergelson teaches a method of capturing, in computer system, data relating to a note-taking session, the session consisting of handwritten annotations made by a user by way of a writing implement on a plurality of printed paper pages (Bergelson, abstract, col.2, lines 47-67; col.3, lines 32-49; a computer system allow users input handwritten, note, marks into printed paper forms/pages to fill the forms/page), each of the plurality of pages including coded data indicative of an identity of the page (Bergelson; col.3, lines 12-19; each form/page includes coded data to indicative the identity of the form/page) and of a plurality of reference points on the page, the coded data identifying a unique location of each of the reference points relative to the page (Bergelson, col.2, lines 1-22; col.3, line 50 – col.4, lines 4; col.6, lines 41-62; each form/page includes plurality of data fields, the coded data identifying a unique form and data fields of the form; “ink data” references to “the image and location of the form identifier, along with image and location data for any other information written on the form by a user”), the method including the steps of:

- receiving, in the computer system and via the writing implement, an indication of the start of the note-taking session (Bergelson, col.2, lines 47-67; col.3, lines 32-49; receiving in the computer system and via writing implement, such as a special pen, an indication to start a filling forms/pages);
- receiving, in the computer system and via the writing implement interacting with the printed paper pages, data indicative of said handwritten annotations made by said user on said plurality of printed paper pages (Bergelson, col.2, lines 47-67; col.3, lines 32-49; receiving in the computer system and via writing implement, such as a special

pen, handwritten annotations made by a user on plurality of printed paper forms/pages);

- receiving, in the computer system and via the writing implement, an indicative of the end of the note-taking session (Bergelson, col.2, lines 47-67; col.3, lines 32-49; receiving in the computer system via writing implement, such as a special pen, an indication to upload the form when finishing filling the form); and
- retaining a retrievable record of the received data of the note-taking session (Bergelson, col.2, lines 47-67; col.3, line 32 – col.4, line 4; storing and loading the filling form to a person computer).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Bergelson teaches wherein the coded data being substantially invisible in the visible spectrum (Bergelson, col.2, lines 1-22; col.3, line 50 – col.4, lines 4; col.6, lines 41-62).

Regarding dependent claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Bergelson teaches wherein said indication of the start of the note-taking session is provided by the computer system receiving data indicative of said handwritten annotations made by said user on said plurality of printed paper pages (Bergelson, col.2, lines 47-67; col.3, lines 32-49).

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Bergelson teaches wherein said plurality of printed paper pages are associated with a control portion comprising at least one control zone, the computer system receiving an indication via said writing implement that said

user has designated one or more control zones using writing implement (Bergelson, col.3, lines 12-49; using the special pen to enter form identification and/or forward/backward forms/pages).

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Bergelson teaches wherein one or more of said printed paper pages includes said control portion (Bergelson, col.3, lines 12-49; using the special pen to enter form identification and/or forward/backward forms/pages).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 6, Bergelson teaches wherein said plurality of printed paper pages is provided in the form of a notepad and the notepad includes said control portion on a part of the notepad other than on one of said pages (Bergelson, col.1, lines 29-35; col.2, lines 47-67; col.3, lines 12-49; using the special pen to enter form identification and/or forward/backward forms/pages on a CrossPad).

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 6, Bergelson teaches wherein said at least one control zone includes a zone associated with the start of the note-taking session, and said indication of the start of the note-taking session is provided by the computer system receiving an indication that said user has designated zone by way of said writing implement (Bergelson, col.2, lines 47-49; col.3, lines 12-49; using the special pen to enter form identification forms/pages on a CrossPad to start filling the forms/pages).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 6, Bergelson teaches wherein said at least one control zone includes a zone associated with the end of the note-taking session, and

said indication of the end of the note-taking session is provided by the computer system receiving an indication that said user has designated zone by way of said writing implement (Bergelson, col.2, lines 47-67; col.3, lines 32-49; receiving in the computer system via writing implement, such as a special pen, an indication to upload the form when finishing filling the form).

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Bergelson teaches wherein said writing implement includes a writing nib and said writing nib is associated with a sensor able to detect nib contact with one of said plurality of printed paper pages (Bergelson, col.1, lines 29-35; a sensor must be included to detect pen movements on the forms/pages).

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent on claim 17, Bergelson teaches wherein each printed paper page includes coded data indicative of an identity of the page, and said indicating data regarding both the position of the writing implement relative to a page and the identity of the page (Bergelson, col.2, lines 1-22; col.3, lines 12-49).

Claims 17, 20, 22, 24-26, 28-29 are for a computer system performing the method of claims 1, 4, 11, 6-8, 9-10, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2178

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

17. Claims 12, 14, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergelson et al., US 6,697,056 B1, filed 01/2000.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Bergelson teaches storing the filled form from a Crosspad to a computer hard drive (Bergelson, col.3, lines 20 and col.4, lines 5-10). Bergelson does not explicitly disclose the step of using said retrievable record to selectively print the data indicative of said handwritten annotation.

However, printing a stored file from a hard drive was well known feature.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a printer into Bergelson's computer system to print filled forms, since including a printer into a computer system was well known in the art to print files stored in a computer.

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, Bergelson teaches storing the filled form from a Crosspad to a computer hard drive (Bergelson, col.3, lines 20 and col.4, lines 5-10). Bergelson does not explicitly disclose wherein the data being printable on a plurality of printed paper pages corresponding to the plurality of pages annotated in the note-taking session.

However, printing a stored file from a hard drive was well known feature.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a printer into Bergelson's computer system to print filled forms, since including a printer into a computer system was well known in the art to print files stored in a computer.

Regarding claim 32, which is dependent on claim 17, Bergelson teaches storing the filled form from a Crosspad to a computer hard drive and form identifiers in a storage (Bergelson, col.3, lines 20 and col.4, lines 5-10). Bergelson does not explicitly disclose including a printer for printing the coded data on the plurality of pages.

However, printing a stored file from a hard drive or storage in a computer was well known feature.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a printer into Bergelson's computer system to print filled forms, since including a printer into a computer system was well known in the art to print files stored in a computer.

18. Claim 13 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergelson as applied to claims 12 and 24 above, and further in view of Moran et al., US 5,717,879, patented 1998.

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, plurality of printed paper pages are associated with a control portion comprising at least one control zone, the computer system receiving an indication via said writing implement that said user has designated one or more

control zones using writing implement (Bergelson, col.3, lines 12-49; using the special pen to enter form identification and/or forward/backward forms/pages). Bergelson does not explicitly teach wherein said plurality of printed paper pages is associated with a control portion including a zone associated with the printing of the note-taking session, the computer system receiving an indication via said writing implement that said user has designated said zone using the writing implement.

Moran teaches a control portion including a zone associated with the printing of the note-taking session, the computer system receiving an indication via said writing implement that said user has designated said zone using the writing implement (Moran, fig.15 “print” command).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have include a zone associated with the printing of note-taking section into Bergelson’s system, since the combination would have printed a note-taking from Crosspad’s control zone.

Claim 30 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 13 and is rejected under the same rationale.

19. Claims 15 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergelson as applied to claims 14 and 30 above, and further in view of Tonkin et al., US 6,616,702 B1, priority filed 1998.

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Bergelson does not explicitly disclose binding plurality of printed pages.

Tonkin teaches a system allows a user specifies a binding type via stylus to binding plurality of printed pages (Tonkin, col.2, lines 43-63; col.4, lines 63-67; and col.10, lines 35-49).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tonkin and Bergelson to bind plurality of printed pages of a document together, since this would have offered features for the print function.

Claim 31 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 15 and is rejected under the same rationale.

20. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergelson as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, and further in view of Wolff et al., US 6,081,261, filed 1995, and Moran et al., US 5,717,879, patented 1998.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 1, Bergelson does not explicitly disclose that the writing implement contains an identification means which imparts a unique identity to the sensing device and identifies it as being associated with a particular user in said note-taking session and in which the method includes monitoring, in the computer system, said identity.

Wolff teaches that a writing implement contains an identification means which imparts a unique identity to the sensing device and identifies it as being associated with a particular user in said note-taking session (Wolff, col.1, line 62 – col.2, line 2; col.2, line 43 – col.3, line 11; and col.10, lines 34-38).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wolff into Bergelson to provide an identification means to identify user who takes note on the forms, note book or documents, since the combination would have distinguished entries from different users as Wolff disclosed in col.10, lines 34-38.

Wolff does not explicitly disclose monitoring said identity in the computer system.

Moran teaches tracking color coded to identify the person in a meeting who annotated on a whiteboard and playing back the meeting session (Moran, col.3, lines 12-23; col.5, lines 19-33 and col.22, lines 8-21)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Moran into Wolff and Bergelson to identify persons during annotation/filling session, since this would have supported workgroup meeting using pen based annotation environment.

21. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergelson as applied to claim 17 as explained above, and further in view of Wolff et al., US 6,081,261, filed 1995.

Regarding claim 21, which is dependent on claim 17, Bergelson teaches a writing implement which includes sensor for detecting said coded data.

Wolff teaches annotating a document using writing implement, the document includes coded data page identification, and writing implement includes a sensor for detecting said code data (Wolff, col.1, line 62 – col.2, line 2; col.2, line 43 – col.3, line 11; col.4, lines 7-12; and col.4, lines 7-12 and lines 52-58).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wolff and Bergelson to provide an input device that include a sensor for recognizing coded data identification, since this would have offer Bergelson's system to use bar code for identify forms or document pages as Wolff disclosed.

22. Claims 23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergelson in view of Wolff as applied to claim 21 as explained above, and further in view of Moran et al., US 5,717,879, patented 1998.

Regarding claim 23, which is dependent on claim 21, Bergelson does not explicitly disclose that the writing implement contains an identification means which imparts a unique identity to the sensing device and identifies it as being associated with a particular user in said note-taking session and in which the method includes monitoring, in the computer system, said identity.

Wolff teaches that a writing implement contains an identification means which imparts a unique identity to the sensing device and identifies it as being associated with a particular user in said note-taking session (Wolff, col.1, line 62 – col.2, line 2; col.2, line 43 – col.3, line 11; and col.10, lines 34-38).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Wolff into Bergelson to provide an identification means to identify user who takes note on the forms, note book or documents, since the combination would have distinguished entries from different users as Wolff disclosed in col.10, lines 34-38.

Wolff does not explicitly disclose monitoring said identity in the computer system.

Moran teaches tracking color coded to identify the person in a meeting who annotated on a whiteboard and playing back the meeting session (Moran, col.3, lines 12-23; col.5, lines 19-33 and col.22, lines 8-21)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Moran into Wolff and Bergelson to identify persons during annotation/filling session, since this would have supported workgroup meeting using pen based annotation environment.

Regarding claim 27, which is dependent on claim 26, Bergelson does not explicitly disclose said plurality of pages being superposed and joined together on a backing sheet, the backing sheet sized to extend beyond at least one edge of the superposed plurality of pages to provide an uncovered extended part, said control portion being provide on said extended part of the backing sheet.

Moran teaches annotation on plurality of pages that being superposed and joined together on a backing sheet, the backing sheet sized to extend beyond at least one edge of the superposed plurality of pages to provide an uncovered extended part, said control portion being provide on said extended part of the backing sheet (Moran, col.3, lines 13-23; col.25, lines 10-23; col.14, lines 25-47; and fig.15, annotations documents on an electronic whiteboard).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Moran and Bergelson to annotate documents in a meeting environment, since whiteboard is used in record and playback annotation portion.

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-17, 19-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue that Levin "provides for annotation of a document with annotations input through an electronic tablet. That is very different from the present invention where data from a note-taking session are captured using a writing implement that interacts with coded data on printed paper pages"; Wolff's bar code identifier is "different from the coded data on printed paper pages wherein the coded data itself identifies a unique location of each of a plurality of reference points on the pages" and "none of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the limitations of the presently amended claims".

However, Bergelson teaches amended limitations as explained in the rejection above.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Carini et al., US 6,456,740 B1, filed 07/1999, teaches method for identifying form type in a handwriting recognition based form completion system.

Nathan et al., US 6,326,9657 B1, filed 01/1999, teaches method for displaying page information in a personal digital notepad.

Arons et al., US 6,529,920 B1, filed 03/1999, teaches multimedia linking device and method.

Rom, US 2002/0146170 A1, priority filed 10/2000, teaches determining form identification through the spatial relationship of input data.

Arruda et al., US 6,806,867 B1, filed 12/1999, teaches palm pad system.

“CossPad”, copyright 1998, pages 1-5.

“Cross Pen computing Group Ships the CrossPad the World’s First Portable Digital Notepad”, 03/1998, pages 1-2.

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO-MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 273-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S Hong can be reached on (571) 273-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TVH
January 3, 2005


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER